

July 30, 1971

Mr. William G. Manning
Administrator, Bailey, Alch & Gillis
One Center Plaza
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Mr. Manning:

Having heard nothing from you since your letter of February 8, I presume Mr. Bailey was without interest in my letter of January 25 to which you did not otherwise respond.

I regret this very much for a number of reasons, one being the fact that you might have learned about me on your own and found what I believe to be the case, that I can be of considerable help to Mr. Bailey in his defense of Jim Garrison (whom I know very well), a worthwhile and important endeavor that I regard as considerably more than the defense of Jim Garrison. I am aware of Mr. Bailey's letter as excerpted in the New Orleans papers and of Jim's long statement issued after he was charged. I am also aware that lawyers need not necessarily say everything they think. Nonetheless, I suggest that what is involved is much, much more than either said or indicated.

I am an experienced, non-orthodox investigator whose work in the field of political assassinations is of longer duration, wider and deeper extent and into more areas, than anyone else who has worked in the field. It is embodied in approximately a million published words that have stood the severe testing of time. It covers extensive areas not touched upon by others and, because it is almost unique in its investigation of the Department of Justice in general, the FBI in particular, and the dishonesty, deliberate rather than accidental, of which both are capable, I think in itself this knowledge, all documented with one of the largest collections of FBI reports, including of New Orleans investigations, may hold considerable potential for you.

These letter are amplified by my personal interviews with people interviewed by the FBI, tape-recorded with permission, and diametrically opposed to the official misrepresentations, also in my possession. My work in New Orleans, as Jim will tell you, was independent of his and not related to Clay Shaw, whom I have never investigated, conceiving him as other than Jim did. However, if a nonlawyer can appraise such things, incidental to this was fact rather than conjecture having to do with federal intervention into Jim's efforts and impropriety by the federal judiciary. Because my work was independent and of different focus, because people spoke to me who would not speak to "the fuzz", because I spoke to people Jim and his staff did not and, I think importantly, because I am the one nonsycophant among the Warren Commission critics who went to New Orleans, I suggest I

may be of further value to you in both understanding and preparing what I think may well wind up as more significant than some of Mr. Bailey's better known cases, such as Shepard.

From the first I stayed as close to these charges as could a bankrupt more than a thousand miles away. My instinctive feeling and immediate analyses are exactly what Mr. Bailey now says and to a degree I have already undertaken an investigation that confirms the purpose of the unseemly and improper federal publicity. I do not know if Jim's chief investigator, Louis Ivon, has provided the few memoranda I sent him on this, but because I still work more than 16 hours a day and he did not respond, I discontinued sending such things to him. However, particularly because of my news background and because of the understanding I think I have of the Department of Justice and the FBI, one of the first things I did was to inquire into the nature and timing of the publicity. Here also I think I can be of help because I have the earlier wire service copy and have spoken with a reporter who immediately inquired into what the government was doing, how and why. Mr. Mitchell announced the thing from Washington, and it was carefully rigged to exploit to the maximum his, J. Edgar Hoover's and the President's attendance at the FBI academy graduation ceremonies, an event always well covered, including by TV cameras, one of the possible explanations of the undue haste in including what happened in New Orleans that very morning and late the night before.

Like many others, I knew Pershing Gervais fairly well. I last saw him in January 1969 when his conversation with me could hardly have been more inconsistent with Mr. Wall's explanation of how and why Gervais came to serve the enemies of his former good friend.

My analysis of what was done, what was planned, how far back it was rigged and who may be involved at an early date, may involve what may not seem immediately apparent to you but I think should be considered in defense preparations.

There may still be people in New Orleans who may have knowledge and might talk with me where they never have with Jim and probably would not to you. It is beyond my capacity, in time or money, for I have no income and am deep in debt, to write you lengthy memos should that interest you or to fly to either New Orleans or Boston. However, I am about an hour from the Baltimore and Washington airports and would be happy to meet anyone of your staff should he have occasion to be at any of them, and I am but an hour from downtown Washington, where I could also go should this interest you.

It may seem far cut for me to suggest that my book, FRAME-UP, and my subsequent relevant investigations on the King assassination could serve purposes for you in this case, but I do believe it possible, even, indeed, probable.

As I am sure you anticipate, you are far from knowing everything that will come out. I have reason, for example, to believe that you should expect at least two more informants to surface. Some one I know and trust has been told this by an official in a position to know. If Bill Alford, whom I also know, should be one or

a witness, I think I can help you with him, especially on his principle, which he addressed in a rather exaggerated form in his resignation, and his attitude toward fixing cases, because he offered to fix one for me.

Whether or not you accept my offers, I would like to thank Mr. Baley for taking this case, especially because I believe it will require an even more extensive investigation than he has forecast and addresses issues, principles and policies wider than he has indicated.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg